

1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)  
United States Attorney

2 MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)  
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 THOMAS M. O'CONNELL (NYSBN 1801950)  
Assistant United States Attorney

5 150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900  
6 San Jose, California 95113  
Telephone: (408) 535-5053  
7 FAX: (408) 535-5066  
Thomas.M.OConnell@usdoj.gov

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 SAN JOSE DIVISION

\*E-FILED - 10/17/06\*

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 CHRISTINA MARIE FLORES, and  
JOSE LITO CAMPOS,

17 Defendants.  
18

No. CR 06-00425 RMW

STIPULATION AND  
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME

SAN JOSE VENUE

19  
20 On September 18, 2006 , the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status  
21 conference. The parties jointly requested that the case be continued to October 23, 2006 at 9:00  
22 a.m. in order for both defense counsel to review the discovery in this case. In addition, the  
23 parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from September 18, 2006 until  
24 October 23, 2006. Defendant Flores, who was present with her attorney, J.A. Hudson, agreed to  
25 the exclusion. Defendant Campos, who was present with his attorney Assistant Federal Public  
26 Defender Cynthia Lie, also agreed to the exclusion. The parties agree and stipulate that an  
27 exclusion of time is appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of  
28 counsel.

SO STIPULATED:

KEVIN V. RYAN  
United States Attorney

DATED: 09/20/06

/s/  
THOMAS M. O'CONNELL  
Assistant United States Attorney

DATED: 09/20/06

/s/  
CYNTHIA C. LIE  
Assistant Federal Public Defender  
Counsel for Mr. Campos

DATED: 09/20/06

/s/  
J.A. HUDSON  
Counsel for Ms. Flores

Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act from September 18, 2006 to October 23, 2006. The Court finds, based on the aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

SO ORDERED.

DATED: 10/17/06

/S/ RONALD M. WHYTE  
RONALD M. WHYTE  
United States District Judge